DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 332 777 JC 910 305

AUTHOR Mohr, Ellen
TITLE A Study of Peer Tutor Training Programs: A League Report.
INSTITUTION Johnson County Community Coll., Overland Park, Kans.; League for Innovation in the Community Coll., Laguna Hills, CA.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 71p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Information Analyses (070) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; Literature Reviews; *Peer Teaching; *Program Design; Program Effectiveness; Questionnaires; Student Attitudes; *Training Methods; *Tutoring; Tutors; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *League for Innovation in the Community College

ABSTRACT

Designed to examine the nature and extent of peer tutoring and tutor training at community colleges, this report reviews the literature on the topic, describes a national study conducted by the League for Innovation in the Community College (LICC), and reports on a survey of the attitudes of peer tutors at Johnson County Community College (JCCC) in Kansas. Chapter 1 discusses the pivotal role peer tutors can play in assisting the large numbers of academically underprepared students who attend "open door" colleges, and provides an overview of JCCC's peer tutor training program. In chapter 2, the literature review is presented, covering the history of peer tutoring, the rationale for tutoring, characteristics of tutor training, specific programs, training techniques, and evaluation. This chapter concludes with a 78-item bibliography. The LICC study is presented in chapter 3, which examines its purpose, methodology, proposed analysis, survey results and implications, and includes a directory of League peer tutor training programs. The LICC study revealed that although most of the responding colleges (N=23) employed peer tutors as a means to assist the underprepared student, few had training programs for their tutors. In chapter 4, the purpose, methodology, proposed analysis, and survey results of the JCCC study of 21 peer tutors employed by the Math, Academic Achievement, and Writing centers are presented. Key findings reported include: (1) respondents ranked patience, a positive attitude, and understanding as the most important personal qualities a peer tutor should possess; and (2) the tutors ranked knowledge of subject and interpersonal skills high. Finally, chapter 5 provides a conclusion and proposes a model for peer tutor programs. Appendixes contain the survey instruments, and verbatim comments from responses to the League survey. (JMC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED332777

A Study of Peer Tutor Training Programs

A League Report

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Mohr

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

submitted by
Ellen Mohr
Johnson County Community College

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

JC 910305

Johnson County Community College

League for Innovation in the Community College

A STUDY OF PEER TUTOR TRAINING PROGRAMS

Ellen Mohr

Johnson County Community College
12345 College at Quivira
Overland Park, Kan. 66210-1299

This document was produced with funding assistance from Johnson County Community College

Johnson County Community College
League for Innovation in the Community College
1991

Author Information

Ellen Mohr is the instructor who directs the Johnson County Community College Writing Center. She oversees the hiring, training and evaluating of the Writing Center peer tutors. She can be contacted at 12345 College Boulevard at Quivira, Overland Park, KS 66210. Telephone (913) 469-6466.

Executive Summary

A study was conducted in August of 1990 to determine the extent and nature of peer tutor training programs across the country. A survey of the colleges which belong to the League for Innovation in the Community College and a review of published literature revealed that although many colleges hire peer tutors to work with underprepared students, only a few have training programs for the peer tutors. This report identifies the characteristics of a peer tutor training program in the review of literature and in the survey.

Although the survey and the review of literature are kept separate, the results of each study are similar. Peer tutors should be hired on the basis of their exhibited knowledge of the content to be tutored, their interpersonal skills, and their work and school record. They should undergo formal training which includes teaching them listening and questioning skills, learning styles, and an overview of the special students who seek help along with the philosophies and goals of the labs and the college. Evaluation should include open-ended questions answered by students who are tutored, instructors who refer students, the director of the center where tutors are employed, and the tutors themselves.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the Johnson County Community College Board of Trustees, the JCCC Administration, and the Sabbatical Committee for providing me the opportunity to pursue an interest of mine--peer tutor training.

I would like to thank the League for Innovation in the Community College representatives who helped to distribute the survey instrument and the many peer tutor directors and instructors who completed the survey. Also, thanks to Dr. Terry O'Bannion and Dr. Don Doucette for their editing suggestions.

I would also like to thank the many people who gave me their support and expertise while I put the report together: Dr. Glen Gabert, Dean of Institutional Planning and Advancement, who has been my mentor throughout the study; Karen Conklin, Market and Survey Research Analyst, who helped me with developing my survey instruments and with analyzing the data; Dr. James Williams, Assistant Dean of the Communications and Academic Enhancement Division, who served as my advisor; and Juliet Kincaid and Virginia Nelson, my colleagues in the English Department, who helped proofread the report in its final stages.

A special thanks also goes to Mary O'Sullivan and other computer support personnel without whom this paper would never have been produced.

Last, but certainly not least, is my sincere thanks to my Writing Center peer tutors, past and present, who have been and always will be my source of enthusiasm and inspiration and to whom I dedicate this publication.

Preface

One of the issues facing many colleges today is how to meet the needs of the underprepared student. This concern is especially apparent in institutions where there is an open enrollment policy. Many innovative services have been created to meet these needs, and of these resources one of the most noteworthy is the employment of peer tutors.

Many colleges hire peer tutors, but often the training and evaluating of the tutors is inadequate or even nonexistent. In four year colleges and universities where upperclassmen or graduate students have major subjects, tutoring becomes an integral part of their college experience. They are often already experts in the subject they're tutoring so they have an air of authority. Conversely, the community college peer tutor often has not yet chosen a special field but has shown a knowledgeable understanding of the subject he is tutoring.

In both instances there is a need for a formal peer tutor training program. This study reveals that many of the community colleges surveyed hire peer tutors and that individual services within the campus may have informal tutor training or a training program for professionals from the community or college staff, but very few have a structured training program for student or peer tutors across the campus.

However, the literature reviewed tells why peer tutors are a good resource, what some programs include in their training and how the program should be evaluated. Thus, this study intends to integrate the theory with the methodology and propose a model peer tutor training program based on the integration.

The study, then, is divided into a review of literature which focuses on the history of peer tutor practices, the rationale for employing peer tutors, and hiring, training and evaluating procedures which are practiced in universities and community colleges across the country. This information is followed by a

survey of the colleges in the League for Innovation in the Community College. The survey looks more specifically at how these colleges hire, train, and evaluate peer tutors. A directory of the responding programs follows the survey. Another survey conducted through Johnson County Community College's peer tutors focuses on the viewpoints of tutors and what they believe should be emphasized in a tutor training program based on their own experiences. The conclusion of the surveys' results points out the correlation between the two studies and the literature review, looks at some issues arising from the study, and synthesizes this information into a model peer tutor training program. The study is followed with a bibliography which includes sources cited in the review of literature, sources not cited but applicable to the subject, and a bibliography of training materials mentioned in the text which might be useful to any college developing a peer tutor program.

The appendices include the survey instruments, cover letter, and the League survey verbatim comments which were individual responses to each question when additional comments were requested. When these remarks were insightful, they were noted in the text of the survey results.

Table of Contents

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
PREFACE	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
Appendices	vii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
History of Peer Tutoring	5
Tutor Rationale	6
Characteristics of Tutor Training	9
Specific Programs	12
Training Techniques	16
Evaluation	18
Conclusion	20
Bibliography and Tools for Training	21
Chapter 3: SURVEY OF LEAGUE COMMUNITY COLLEGES	29
Purpose	29
Methodology	29
Proposed Analysis	30
Survey Results	31
Discussion of Results	38
Directory of League Peer Tutor Training Programs	39
Chapter 4: SURVEY OF JCCC PEER TUTORS	42
Purpose	42
Methodology	42

Proposed Analysis 43
Survey Results 43

Chapter 5: CONCLUSION AND PROPOSED MODEL 44

APPENDICES

Page

Appendix A 49
League Survey of peer tutor training practices
Cover Letter

Appendix B 50
Peer Tutor Survey of tutor characteristics

Appendix C 51
Verbatim Comments from the League Survey

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Number of peer tutor training programs	31
Table 2: Courses offering tutoring service	32
Table 3: Methodology for training	33
Table 4: Compensation	34
Table 5: Evaluation	35
Table 6: Obstacles of a tutor training program	37

Chapter 1
Introduction

Walk onto any campus and you will see small groups of students, their heads together and their books and papers strewn all about them, animatedly chattering about facts needed for a test, arguing about the details in someone's notes, or reading each other's papers. It is a natural act for students from the same class to seek out one another to study together, to reinforce information, to clarify assignments and notes, and to just generally support each other. This act of collaborative learning becomes peer tutoring when it is structured or formalized.

Throughout the evolution of American education, instructors have utilized various methods to help troubled students learn important skills from those students who are more skilled. Small group work has often been a mainstay in classes where numbers are too large for the teacher to give individual attention. The groups are strategically chosen so that an even number of those "good students" are leading the less knowledgeable or younger students. These "good students" become peer tutors, generally being called upon to individually assist those students who need "extra" help. The leaders for collaborative sessions in the classroom often are the prime candidates for peer tutor positions.

Furthermore, community colleges with their "open door" philosophy to offer a higher education to everyone has necessitated providing instructional strategies so that weaker students can succeed in reaching their educational goals. Individualized instruction has played a key role in helping many community college students raise their skill levels and obtain those goals. In many cases writing centers, math labs, learning centers, and other student services have provided the individualized instruction, assessing the need of the individual and then working to meet those needs. Peer tutors or students

working in these centers have provided the work force.

Why have peer tutors been preferred over instructors or para-professionals? Of course, from a budget standpoint they cost less. But beyond that is the fact that some students actually prefer working with other students. Working with peer tutors may be less stressful than working with faculty. In community colleges where the average age is 28, the returning adult appreciates support from peers.

This study begins with a rationalization of the use of peer tutors as a supplement to classroom instruction. The term peer is emphasized because the study begins with the assumption that students helping other students is a strategy which has been proven to be successful in dealing with basic skills needs and the underprepared student. The enrolled student, non-degreed, is the focus of the study, not graduate students, part-time instructors, or members of the community. Because many of the studies do not distinguish between student or peer tutor and professional tutor, it is important to note that this study does make that important distinction.

The study looks at hiring, training, and evaluating peer tutors who work in labs or centers which serve the underprepared student and concludes with a proposal which outlines the qualities of a model program.

Overview of JCCC Peer Tutor Practices

The Johnson County Community College Writing Center has been staffed with peer tutors since 1980. Also, part-time or adjunct instructors who taught composition classes worked in the Writing Center. During those three years the division chairman selected the tutors on the recommendation of the composition instructors, which is still an important citerion today. Tutees were primarily referred by composition instructors who prescribed what should be covered. There was no training, no evaluation of the tutors. Nevertheless, the tutors worked well with tutees.

In 1983 a full-time instructor at JCCC was assigned to direct the Writing

Center. As the Center grew and more students came on their own from all disciplines, the need for more formal training was recognized. At this time hiring, training, and evaluating procedures were improved and expanded. Muriel Harris's *A Sourcebook for Writing Labs*, and Reigstad and McAndrew's book *Training Tutors for Writing Centers* were used as the primary sources to develop the program. A tutor handbook which was divided into JCCC Writing Center procedures, techniques and strategies plus other pertinent information gathered from numerous sources was created. For interviewing and selecting tutors, the tutors took a test which had writing samples with errors and received a personal interview. This procedure is still being used at the present time.

For training the director met with the tutors in two workshops of approximately three hours each to go over procedures and then to discuss potential tutees and their typical writing problems-

1. Who are the tutees?
2. What is the hierarchy of concerns?
3. What resources (handouts, software, handbooks) are available and how can they be used?

Each year other elements were added to these workshops--one year role modeling was added, another year when there were many returning tutors, experienced tutors mentored new tutors. Gradually the program grew. Now during each school year tutors meet frequently for about two hours to discuss problems, successes, and other topics of interest. Tutors are paid for all meetings and workshops.

While the Writing Center was developing its tutor program, other similar programs began elsewhere on campus. As early as 1982, the Math Lab began hiring peer tutors rather informally to work with students having problems in math. A more structured program began in 1988. The math tutors like the Writing Center tutors are on hand for drop-in students. The math tutors' training is somewhat limited to one-on-one sessions with the director, frequent memorandums, and several meetings or workshops each semester. Also in 1988, JCCC's Academic Achievement Center (AAC) began hiring peer

tutors, on a limited basis, to tutor specific subjects at specific times. The director of the AAC hires, trains, and evaluates the tutors on an individual basis. Each year, as needs warrant, the director expands the tutoring services and the number of tutors employed.

All instructors who work with peer tutors know the benefits. They are cost effective, they relate well with other students, and they are conscientious about their work. It is also known that training tutors is very important. It is then the intent of this study to focus on the characteristics or attributes of a formal or structured model peer tutor training program which would bring all of JCCC's peer tutors together to learn general tutor skills. The study will consist of five parts: a review of literature, a survey of the colleges in the League for Innovation in the Community College, a survey of JCCC's peer tutors, a directory of peer tutor training programs in the League colleges, and a proposal for a program for Johnson County Community College.

For the review of literature, an on-line search of educational materials was conducted through the ERIC files, an on-line search through Phi Delta Kappan's research center, and a search using bibliographies found in many of the professional articles the writer has been collecting through the years.

Chapter 2
Review Of The Literature

History of Peer Tutoring

Tutoring as a primary way to instruct can be traced to the Socratic method of questioning students individually or in small groups. In England tutorial sessions with instructors once a week have been a traditional and integral part of the educational system (Zaritsky 1, 2). In this country older students have helped younger students to read in a natural collaborative environment like the one-room country school. This strategy has carried over into elementary and secondary schools where programs encourage mentoring with big sister/brother reading to younger students, creating crafts or art projects, or helping with math or science problems. Harvard University has had a tutorial system using faculty since 1912 and more recently added peer tutors as a supplement to its coursework for freshmen and sophomores (Zaritsky 1, 2).

For many years colleges have supported tutoring services for specialized audiences like athletes and the hearing impaired. The GI Bill supported veterans who wanted to further their education by providing tutoring services free of charge. Since the 1960's federal and state governments have funded programs for the educationally and economically disadvantaged student (Maxwell 1).

In the 1970's community colleges with their open enrollment policies used the tutorial system to help students acquire skills needed for college-level courses. Individualizing instruction by assessing the student's needs and then providing materials and instruction to meet those needs was and still is an important component in first attracting a student to college and then retaining him/her. In Patricia Cross's study of the ways community colleges

adapt to the needs of their students, she writes, "The predominant trend is toward individualized instruction. ...Peer tutoring, team teaching, and cooperative education all showed large increases from 1970 to 1974" (2, 3).

Individualized instruction became a key term in education during the 1970's. Developed in the early 1980's, an organization called the International Society for Individualized Instruction hoped to promote a movement to develop individualized instruction programs in public education. Supplemental instruction orginally developed as an alternative to tutoring also individualizes instruction (Maxwell 2); however, it focuses on high risk courses while peer tutoring focuses on high risk students (Zaritsky 5).

"Today, almost all colleges in the United States offer individual content tutoring, and more than half offer group tutoring," notes Martha Maxwell in her 1990 review of literature about peer tutoring (1).

Tutor Rationale

Not only are tutors a part of the evolution of education, but they have also been heralded as an important component in studies on retention and student success.

In 1984 John Roueche wrote about the need for community colleges to address the basic skills of students entering institutions with open enrollment policies, noting that the programs that have achieved the most success are those that use peer tutors (Lit. Needs 7). He, furthermore, "identified eleven elements common to those developmental programs reporting the most complete and promising retention data...." Among those criteria was the employment of peer tutors (7).

In another study conducted at the University of Cincinnati tutored students were shown to be more likely retained than non-tutored groups (Koehler 1). High risk students can be helped in a non-threatening environment.

One of the reasons tutoring programs are successful is that students seeking help do not experience the failure they may feel in the classroom. Tutors relate well to other students; they are students themselves and may have even seeked tutoring. Studies show that often the best tutors are the ones who have at one time been tutees themselves (Garstka 14). In the student-shared experience both tutor and client gain confidence (Zartisky 4). Grant and Hoeber note that the peer tutor's experience with being a student allows him/her an empathy for his/her fellow student. The tutee, knowing his/her tutor has gone through similar problems, enjoys the "shared experience" (Garstka 14). Tutors are often able to explain subject content from a more practical level than the instructor because they can interject their own experiences with the material. There is a certain amount of flexibility in tutoring which allows the tutor to monitor the student's progress and restructure, if necessary, the instruction, a strategy not always possible in the classroom or on a computer (Elliott 356). In Beck's study of the tutor program at Nassau Community College, an overwhelming majority of tutees preferred student-tutors to faculty-tutors. Furthermore, the instructors of the tutees believed that the tutees gained as much from the student tutors as they did from faculty-tutors. Several instructors noticed increased enthusiasm in the content area in students who had worked with peer tutors (Schaier 27). Because of the individualization of the instruction, the tutees can work at their own pace, thus lessening stress (Reed 64). It is important to note here that several studies have emphasized the one-on-one instruction, the tutor/tutee ratio. That one-to-one ratio is the most desirable (Reed 41); however, small groups of two to four tutees working on similar problems can be beneficial where numbers of tutees have become unmanageable (Reed 50).

Several studies attesting to the validity of peer tutor practices note that these programs are also cost effective (Zaritsky 4) (Olson 11). Although one study looked at the feasibility of the one time purchase of computer hardware and software over the long term commitment of hiring tutors (Niemiec 750), most advocates of peer tutor programs say there is no comparison. They are completely different strategies. The peer tutor is a necessary irreplaceable element in individualized instruction. Computer-aided instruction is a supplement, possibly an enhancement, but never a replacement for the

human interaction found in a tutoring session. Furthermore, it is debatable whether one is more cost-effective than the other (Levin 748).

Another attribute of peer tutoring is its effect on the tutors themselves. Along with building confidence and improving self-image (Elliott 536), tutors develop personal pride. They want to gain respect from their peers by showing their understanding of the subject matter and likewise the tutees want to prove to the tutors that they can do well academically. "The pride factor contributes significantly to the success of peer tutoring" (Reed 64). Gene Kerstiens notes in his study of the tutor program at El Camino that "a substantial number of tutors prove to be extremely dedicated and effective individuals whose services to tutees are invaluable (15). Elliott summarizes the benefits of peer tutoring as follows:

1. provides immediate feedback to tutee responses
2. allows students to find their own voice
3. develops for the tutor a sense of responsibility and cooperation
4. provides a role model
5. focuses attention on learning and the individual. (537-538)

As Kerstiens so aptly puts it, "A substantial number of students would not persevere, survive, or succeed in academic courses without tutorial assistance" (15).

The fact is attitudes have changed toward tutoring. What was once perceived negatively as a sign of failure or as a service only the wealthy could afford has now become a widely accepted method for helping students to succeed (Maxwell 1) (Zaritsky 4) (Cooke). Several recent articles about peer tutors in writing centers point to the reality of tutorials which are collaborative discussions rather than instructional sessions. Either we need a more broad interpretation of the term "peer tutor" or we need a better term. We need to get away from the traditional attitude that tutors are authoritative figures who assist with remedial instruction. Instead we need to embrace the collaborative philosophy that tutors and tutees are working together toward a common goal (Trimbur) (Runciman). If the current trend in education sees

peer tutoring as a form of collaboration which has been heralded as a major revolutionary force changing educational practices in the classroom, then it seems only reasonable that more positive attitudes toward tutoring shall follow.

Characteristics of Tutor Training

Experts agree that tutor programs should include a careful screening of tutor candidates (Maxwell 1). Most colleges rely on faculty recommendations basing their selection on the tutor's knowledge of the subject and interpersonal skills. Others post flyers, submit articles or ads for school newspapers, or solicit candidates from honors programs or higher level courses. In the sixty-four schools that Reed surveyed, he found the following criteria was used to select peer tutors: GPA of at least 3.0 or B, demonstrated proficiency in the subject area to be tutored, sensitivity, understanding, and an ability to relate to all students, financial need, faculty recommendation, voluntary association, department chairman recommendation, former tutee status, and/or graduate student status. Kenneth Brufee in his study of the development of Brooklyn College's Writing Center noted that "Tutoring requires self awareness and intellectual keenness" (Schaeir 18). Fawcett and Sandberg write in their study of the Bronx Community College that four qualities are important: patience, friendliness, a positive, non-judgmental attitude, and punctuality (Schaier 51).

While hiring knowledgeable and empathetic tutors is a requirement essential for an effective peer tutor program, developing a tutor training program is equally as important. Reed writes, "It is important...that potential tutors undergo systematic training if they are to be effective" (47). Garstka notes that "Successful peer tutoring programs provide regular ongoing training for the tutors" (15).

Most of the literature studied agreed that certain topics should be covered in the tutor training sessions. These areas include the following:

1. **An orientation/informational session** which explains the goals and

organizational structure of the centers where tutoring takes place, the locality and uses of resources available to the tutors, and record-keeping procedures (Starks 2) (Reed 45). Resources should never substitute for the one-on-one instruction, and must be flexible. Bannister places this principle in the proper perspective with the following comment:
"... to respond to a situation rather than get locked into a method" (4).

2. **General tutoring techniques** which are based on the premise that tutors have internalized the teaching model where information must be explained or lectured because that is the traditional method by which they have learned. Thus, tutors must be taught a new model, preferably not through explaining or lecturing (Baley 1).

3. **Student services** which let tutors know where to send students who have problems they are not equipped to counsel (Starks 2) (Elliott) (Decker).

4. **Questioning skills and probing skills** (Starks 2) which encourage the tutee to verbalize what he/she doesn't understand and then, as Decker writes, formulate questions which "activate(s) thought processes and allow(s) for a give-and-take between student and tutor" (14), thus urging the tutee to find his/her own solution (88).

5. **Study skills** (Starks 2)which help tutors become aware of their own study skills and the importance of understanding the learning styles and needs of the tutees (Edwards 87) and that they must not push their learning styles onto the tutees nor make assumptions about the tutees nor make assumptions about the tutee's way of learning (Johanek 7). Schaier writes that tutors must learn "...to develop a sensitivity to their students' problems and make appropriate non-threatening responses" (12).

6. **Special needs of international students, handicapped students and learning disabled students** (Starks 2) which prepare tutors for the typical problems of this specialized audience.

7. **A rapport established between tutors and faculty members** (Starks 2) so

that all parties concerned have confidence in the system. In his article about maintaining and establishing a writing center Olson says, "...[W]arn tutors against publicly disagreeing with a grade a student has received on a paper; caution them against proofreading someone's paper to avoid the temptation of making corrections..."(13). Tutors should not try to interpret an assignment (Edwards 89) and should feel comfortable with talking to the tutee's instructor and/or seeking help when they don't know the answer (Edwards 90). Reed adds that establishing rapport should include "...a sincere relationship with the tutee without fostering tutee dependency" (45).

8. **Building positive self-concepts in students** (Starks 2) which can be provided in "motivational techniques" (Garstka 14) trains the tutor to encourage the tutee by helping him to gain self-confidence and develop a sense of pride in his work (Edwards 90).

Although some of the literature studied is specific to certain disciplines or areas, i.e., math, writing, or study skills, certain assumptions about the tutor training process are true generally.

These assumptions are the following:

1. that peer tutors are an excellent resource for supplemental instruction.
2. that they are cost-effective and highly reliable.
3. that they can be taught tutoring techniques.
4. that they need to be competent in the subject area to be tutored.
5. that they gain as much being tutors as tutees gain from being tutored.
6. that they help build student self-image thus effecting student success and retention.
7. that they are helpers, not instructors. (Baley 2)

Specific Programs--Theories and Methodologies

As many training programs exist as there are colleges who support them. The general characteristics and assumptions just discussed in this study underlie the individual methods used.

Reed summarized the tutor program goals in his study:

1. To provide academic support for students who lack the educational background for college work.
2. To ensure student retention in college and subsequent graduation.
3. To help students develop self-concept.
4. To help students develop self-confidence and reduce the feeling of fear of failure.
5. To improve human relations and the sense of campus community among students
6. To provide individualized help.
7. To provide help in developing study skills
8. To improve academic performance.
9. To improve basic skills in reading and the use of language.
10. To help students adjust to college. (9)

Elliott notes that "[s]elected elements of the structured tutoring model include specified instructional objectives, logical sequencing of learning steps, appropriate instructional materials and media, validated tutoring techniques, and assessment of learning outcomes" (356).

Many programs tend to focus on specific philosophies or methodologies. A summary of these methodologies follows:

Gartska notes in her study that Roueche and Snow believe ". . . peer tutors need training in **motivational techniques** related to self-concept development, academic attack skills, and interviewing and teaching techniques" (14).

Assertiveness training programs are designed to train tutors in how to deal with difficult people and with some typical problems they might encounter.

Closely related to assertiveness training is **behavioral studies,** where tutors are taught to not only understand their own pattern of study and learning behavior but also to look at the tutee's study pattern. Proponents distinguish between study skills and study behaviors, suggesting developmental programs take into consideration factors gathered in an assessment of study behavior. The Study Behavior Inventory is one such assessment published by Andragogy Associates in Scottsdale, Arizona (Bliss 14) [See Tools for Training] and used in some colleges. One college in particular using the Andragogy Study Behavior Inventory is Scottsdale Community College in the Maricopa District.

Learning strategies connect to behavioral studies and are also taught in training sessions for peer tutors. Approaches vary. At St. Cloud University Writing Center, the assessment of learning styles is important to understanding writing as a learning mode. There, along with other assessment tools, the director uses Kolb's Learning Style Inventory which divides learning into perceiving and processing. Of course, individual learners perceive and process information in different ways. All sorts of factors influence how a person learns: concrete hands-on personal experiences, abstract conceptualizing through media modes (reading, viewing, listening) (Johanek 3). Using the Kolb inventory to assess their own learning styles and to observe the learning styles of others helps tutors to have a better understanding of the needs of their tutees (Johanek 4). Although other learning strategy studies exist, they all tend to be similar except in terminology. Dr. Bernice McCarthy has synthesized many of the learning behavior theories (Piaget, Jung, Dewey, Kolb, and right brain/left brain theorists, just to name a few) into the 4MAT System. 4Mat through a Learning Style Inventory (Kolb) shows the individual's favoritism toward a style but encourages teaching to all styles. [See Tools for Training] Several reference books on learning styles are included in the bibliography of this paper. The importance of these studies for tutors is that they understand 1) that individual learning styles vary, 2) that different assignments require

different learning strategies, 3) that assessing learning styles helps to define the learning strategies.

A study of **cognitive skills** is also helpful for peer tutors in training about learning styles. The process by which knowledge is acquired (ie, perception, reasoning or intuition) is a basis for setting high order concerns (a hierarchy of concerns or list of priorities) and low order concerns (Reigstad 11). In the writing process, for instance, a high-order concern would be the focus or thesis of the writing assignment while a low-order concern would be mechanics.

Another theory discussed in the literature reviewed focuses on training tutors to recognize and help overcome **learning blocks.** Obviously, this focus underlies the previous discussions on learning styles and behaviors and those experiences and influences which have affected how students learn.

The **collaborative learning** theory made clearest in an article by Kenneth Brufee, "Collaborative Learning and the 'Conversation of Mankind'," promotes the power of peer influence on educational practice. Brufee is, of course, talking about peer critiquing in the classroom as well as in peer tutoring (638). His essay has had a pronounced impact on writing centers as they exemplify the collaborativeness inherent in writers. Writers gather together to discuss their experiences, problems, and successes in a social environment.

Probing and questioning skills as listed earlier are based on the Socratic method or inductive reasoning. More specifically they help the tutor to set "instructional hierarchies." Tutors learn to first get the tutee to verbalize his/her needs, next to find out what the tutee has done thus far, and then to help the tutee through questioning to find his/her own solution to the problem. In other words keeping the session centered on the tutee and what his/her needs are and not allowing the tutee to control the session and manipulate the tutor into solving the problem. For example, math tutors learn to lead tutees to fill in missing parts of the instructional hierarchy (Baley 3, 4).

Speir's interactive analysis outlines three conversational procedures for the tutor and tutee: 1) Question-and-answer sequences have the tutor set up a chain of questions and answers. Some questions are open-ended requiring detailed answers; some are close-ended requiring only a yes or no or may even be rhetorical calling for no response. 2) Elliptical utterances require both participants to refer to comments made earlier. 3) Utterance extension and completion have participants extend on previous comments and add to the dialogue (Reigstad 3).

Decker warns that tutors should not look for or dwell on unmarked errors in the tutee's work but should, instead, find the tutee's level of understanding and work from there (17). Furthermore, the tutor should avoid overloading the tutee (Olson, *Maintaining*, 13).

Dowling and Fassler's study of La Guardia Community College explains their tutor training requires tutors in writing, ESL, and Reading labs to attend weekly workshops based on **counseling- (CL) theory** and its application. "The general 'tradition' of CL is this integration of principles, sensitivities and skills from counseling with those of the individual's own disciplines" (18).

The use of an integrated learning model (ILM) based on an analogy for human information processing theorized by Hunt, 1962; Simon and Feigenbaum, 1964 (HIP) is the focus for another tutor training program (Schmelzer 1-4). The theory is based on the knowledge that the peer tutor needs to identify the problem--the what is easy but the why requires a basic understanding of the learning process. ILM consists of five phases: 1) Preparation which is a prerequisite to input including skill level, environment, experience, etc.; 2) Input which affects the quality of reading and studying. How well a person inputs is dependent on how well prepared that person is to learn; 3) Processing which is the depth which the person needs or wants for comprehension. It includes organizing, understanding requirements, applying techniques for learning and increasing the ability to read efficiently; 4)Storage which is remembering what has been processed and includes techniques for improving memory and retention; 5) Output

which includes the skills necessary for demonstrating learning has taken place (Schmelzer 1-4).

Training Techniques

The format which these numerous yet related theories take varies. Most of the literature discourages using a lecture format for training tutors. Instead usually a variety of strategies is used. Reed notes that tutors should have the opportunity to demonstrate their understanding of the tutor program objectives through discussion, role-playing, and evaluation. He feels that a period of internship affords the opportunity for reasonable assurance that the novice tutor understands his or her role (46).

Some colleges offer credit courses in training tutors. Nassau Community College trains tutors in a course called Advanced Composition: Writing and Tutoring. It is a three-credit English elective requiring one lab hour of tutoring (Beck 27). Peer Tutoring Techniques is offered at Stanford University for one credit and meets one hour a week in a seminar format. Students are required to read selections from *Conceptual Blockbusting* by James Adams, *How To Study in College* by Walter Pauk, *Intelligence Can Be Taught* by Arthur Whimbey, and Learning Assistance Center (LAC) study skills hand-outs. Walker summarizes the program: "We videotape portions of two of each tutor's sessions: one at the start of the quarter and one at the end. We require that each tutor interview the instructor for each course in which he tutors. Class discussions vary over the quarter. Some are devoted to the three main themes of the readings: 1) tutoring theory or how to tutor, 2) common problem solving blocks, and 3) effective learning skills and study techniques. Others involve critiquing the videotapes or sharing particularly difficult tutoring problems tutors have recently experienced" (6).

Reed's study of colleges notes that the programs were generally one to five hours of initial training, a special program during the summer, or a course during the school year (16).

Linda Bannister-Wills describes several peer tutor training programs for

writing centers in an article published in Gary Olson's NCTE book *Writing Centers-Theory and Administration*. Bannister-Wills notes that generally the training is either offered in a course or practicum or consists of meetings or workshops. As examples of credit courses, she describes Bruffee's "Brooklyn Plan" as "focusing on writing and thinking processes" (133), Berkeley University's program where tutors earn credit through the education department, and several other colleges where tutors not only learn and practice tutoring techniques but also do research. Programs not offering credit tend to focus on role playing and learning styles (audio, visual and tactile) ("Developing a Peer" 134, 135).

Role playing seems to be a particularly favorable approach to peer tutor training. Included in Winnie Cooke's study of resources for student learning is an explanation of role playing: " [O]ne person assumes the role of tutor, one person the role of tutee, and one person the role of observer. Using the principles of Problem Solving, the tutor counsels the tutee for a ten minute session... while the observer takes notes" (47).

Videotapes are used in a wide range of tutor training programs. Some are like those described above--tapings of tutor sessions which are used later in discussions critiquing the presentations. UCLA has developed a professional set of videotapes, *The Tutor's Guide*, which include general tutor information and information specific to individual disciplines. The Maricopa Community College district has used the UCLA tapes as a basis for their tutor training program. The DeAnza-Foothills District also uses these videotapes in their training. Tutors view the tapes, answer questions, keep learning logs, and then discuss in small seminars what they have learned.

One of the Maricopa colleges, Paradise Valley Community College, has had its program certified by the College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA) and has three levels of tutor mastery. Level 1 training (tutor intern) requires new tutors to complete 15.5 hours of training over one or more semesters. Level 2 training (certified tutor -Level 1) requires returning tutors to act as mentors to new tutors. Level 3 training (certified tutor -Level 2) requires tutors to complete levels 1 and 2 training, become more involved as mentors

and select an area in which to increase their experise and develop and complete a special project. Certified Tutor, Level 3 is a tutor who has completed all three levels of training and is a master tutor.

Maxwell notes in her study of tutoring literature that "In 1989, NADE committee developed standards and guidelines for college tutoring programs along the lines of the CAS Standards for Learning Assistance Centers" (1).

Jeanette Harris writes about "The Handbook as a Supplement to a Tutor Training Program." She emphasizes that it should not replace the training program but serve only as a supplement assisting the training director in communicating guidelines and policies. She details what should be included in the handbook:

1. Philosophy, objectives, and policies
2. General procedure information
3. Special audiences and courses
4. Materials, resources--their location and uses

She, furthermore, notes that the handbook should be informative and readable (divided into parts) so that the information is easy to find (144-151).

Evaluation

Evaluating a peer tutor program is essential; finding the best tool for that evaluation is difficult. Mike Rose in his book *Lives on the Boundary* speaks highly of peer tutoring and its effects on the underprepared student, but he is totally frustrated over administrative directives which insist on his providing statistics to prove peer tutoring is successful (Rose 200) (Maxwell 4).

Erickson and Cromack in their study also note the difficulty of assessing tutoring programs objectively, mainly because the group tutoring most effects are those students "most in need" (1).

A recently published article about the evaluation of writing lab tutorials emphasizes the helpfulness of tutorial observations. The form, modified by Bonnie Devet who is the Writing Lab director at the College of Charleston,

Charleston, South Carolina, uses a categorical system for observing both the tutor and the tutee. The form is derived from Flanders' Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC) which directly observes verbal behavior. Devet notes that the nature of the categories which look for high ratings where the session is tutee-centered and low ratings where the session becomes tutor-centered helps to reinforce the principles of effective tutoring and show the tutor the areas where he/she can improve.

According to Starks the data collected should be both quantitative and qualitative, and the questions should be tailored to the individual program. "Data that may be helpful to collect for administrative purposes are number of tutors, number of clients, number of hours tutored for each client, beginning and ending grades of the client, amount of money, and comments from evaluation questionnaires. Average number of hours spent per student, average grade, and percentage of students passing the course may be helpful. Be cautious about comparing grade point averages. However, retention rates can often show positive results when compared to general college statistics" (3).

Reed comments that for an evaluation tool to be effective it must demand the following:

1. the cooperation of evaluators and program directors and other staff,
2. that program goals are clear and objectives measureable, and
3. that the purposes of the evaluation be known in advance (62).

Maxwell in her study of literature on peer tutor programs notes that evaluation tools used in most colleges show a need for improvement. Most of the programs neglected to ask questions about how the program affected the tutee or questions about the physical lay-out of the program--noise level, location, receptionist, and so forth. Few of the questionnaires asked open-ended questions, and some were repetitious (3).

In short, evaluations can take all forms. Some ask tutees to evaluate tutors. Others are evaluative questions filled out by professional observers and then used in one-on-one sessions with the tutors. Still others are self-evaluations discussed individually with the tutor director.

Conclusion

This review of the literature has shown that there are three important components to an effective peer tutor program: the selection of tutors, the training, and the evaluation. That peer tutors can and do have a significant impact on student success in higher education is unquestionable. Furthermore, that peer tutors also benefit from the program is seen in numerous studies. As Decker writes..."They, [peer tutors] too, develop greater confidence, they learn how to conduct groups, how to keep records, how to confront students and faculty and how to deal with hostility and disappointment. Tutors learn how to divide their time, devise better programs and do research" (14). An added benefit is that a lab employed with peer tutors is a resource for potential teachers. Students working in this environment often decide to pursue teaching as their chosen profession (Clark 347) (Harris 113).

As Herbert Thelen in 1968 stated in the *School Review:*

> Educators, almost to a man, feel that tutoring (by students) 'works.' I can think of no other innovation which has been so consistently perceived as successful. (Elliott 535)

Bibliography

Note: This bibliography includes not only the literature which I reviewed and/or cited in this study, but other references which may be helpful to anyone who proposes to conduct a similar study or to develop a peer tutor program. However, this bibliography is not inclusive and further references can be found in the bibliographies attached to numerous cited articles and books.

*Sources cited in the text

Arkin, Marion, and Barbara Sholler. *The Tutor Book*. New York: Longman, 1982.

*Baley, John, and Ken Klopfenstein. "Workshop on Tutor Training." AMATYC conference, Dallas, Texas, 19 October, 1990.

*Bannister, Linda. "Peer Tutor Training--An On-Going Process." *Proceedings of the Southeastern Writing Center Conference*. Feb. 1982: 71-81.

*Bannister-Wills, Linda. "Developing a Peer Tutor Program." *Writing Centers--Theory and Administration*. Ed. Gary A. Olson. Urbana, Ill.: NCTE, 1984. 132-143.

*Beck, Paula. "Peer-Tutoring at a Community College." *Critical Issues in Tutoring*. ERIC, 1979. ED 174290.

Blanc, R.A., L. E. DeBuhr, and D. C. Martin. "Breaking the Attrition Cycle: The Effects of Supplemental Instruction on Undergraduate Performance and Attrition." *Journal of Higher Education* 54 (1983) : 81-90.

*Bliss, Leonard B., and Richard J. Mueller. "Assessing Study Behaviors of

College Students: Findings from a New Instrument." *Journal of Developmental Education* II (Nov. 1987): 14-18.

Brandwein, Ann Cohen, and Anthony DiVittis. "The Evaluation of a Peer Tutoring Program: A Quantitive Approach." *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 45 (Spring 1985): 15-27.

Brown, B.E. "A Model University Tutor Training Model." Staff Development for Learning Support Services 4 *New Directions for College Learning Assistance.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

*Bruffee, Kenneth A. "Collaborative Learning and the Conversation of Mankind." *College English* 46 (Nov. 1984) : 635-652.

*_____. "Some Comments on the Development of the Brooklyn College Writing Center." *Critical Issues in Tutoring.* ERIC, 1979. ED 174290.

*_____. "Two Related Issues in Peer Tutoring: Program Structure and Tutor Training." *College Composition and Communication* 31 (1980): 76.

*Clark, Irene Lurkis. "Preparing Future Composition Teachers in the Writing Center." *College Composition and Communication* 39 (Oct. 1988): 347-353.

*Cooke, Winne. *Resources for Student Learning--National Project II: Alternatives to the Revolving Door.* ERIC,1977. ED 154866.

Criscuolo, N.P. "Training Tutors Effectively." *The Reading Teacher* 25 (Nov. 1971): 157-159.

Cross, Patricia. *Accent on Learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1976.

_____. *Beyond the Open Door.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1974.

*_____. "1970 to 1974: Years of Change for Community Colleges." ERIC, 1974. ED 110111.

*DeCiccio, Albert C., et. al. "Merrimack College Peer Tutor Training Tape." ERIC, 1986. ED 283143.

Decker, Anne F. "A Centralized Tutoring Program." *Critical Issues in Tutoring*. ERIC, 1979. ED 174290.

*Devet, Bonnie. "A Method for Observing and Evaluating Writing Lab Tutorials." *The Writing Center Journal* X (Spring, Summer 1990): 75-83.

Dowling, Gretchen, and Doris Fassler. "The Tutoring-Counseling Service." *Critical Issues in Tutoring*. ERIC, 1979. ED 174290.

Draper, Virginia. "Training Peer Tutors for College Writers: Respect, Response, Dialogue." ERIC, 1979. ED 186909.

Dubois, N. "A Cognitive Information Processing Model of Studying." Paper presented at the 9th annual conference of the National Association for Developmental Education, St. Louis, March 8, 1985.

Dunn, Rita ,and Kenneth Dunn. *Teaching Students Through Their Individual Learning Styles: a Practical Approach*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1978.

*Edwards, Suzanne. "Tutoring Your Tutors." *Proceedings of the Southeastern Writing Center Conference*. ERIC, Feb. 1982. ED 214164.

*Elliott, Arthur. "Student Tutoring Benefits Everyone." *Phi Delta Kappan* (April 1973): 535-538.

*Erickson, Marilyn R., and Theodore Cromack. "Evaluating a Tutoring Program." *The Journal of Experimental Education* 41 (Winter 1972).

*Fawcett, Susan, and Alvin Sandberg. "Suggestions for Successful Tutoring." *Critical Issues in Tutoring*. ERIC, 1979. ED 174290.

*Garstka, Polly. "The Role of Tutoring in Community Colleges." ERIC, March 30, 1979. ED 168613.

Glassman, Susan. "Training Peer Tutors Using Video." ERIC, 1984. ED 252875.

Hancock, K. "Assertiveness Training." *The Tutoring Exchange* 5 (Spring 1989): 2.

*Harris, Jeanette. "The Handbook as a Supplement to a Tutor Training Program." *Writing Centers-Theory and Administration.* Ed. Gary Olson. Urbana, Ill.: NCTE, 1984. 144-151.

*Harris, Muriel. *Tutoring Writing: A Sourcebook for Writing Labs.* Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1982.

Hedges, L.V., and K. Majer. *A Longitudinal Comparative Study of a Process-oriented Tutorial Program.* (OASIS Research Report No. 5). LaJolla, CA.: Office of Academic Support and Student Services, University of California, San Diego, 1976.

Irwin, D.E. "Effects of Peer Tutoring on Academic Achievement and Affective Adjustment." *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Conference of the Western College Reading Association.* 1980: 42-45.

_____. "Final Statistics Grade as a Function of the Amount of Tutoring Received." *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Conference of the Western College Reading and Learning Association.* 1981: 55-62.

*Johanek, Cindy. "Learning Styles: Issues, Questions, and the Roles of the Writing Center Tutor." Midwest Writing Center Association Conference, Kansas City, 1988. Unpublished paper.

*Kerstiens, Gene. "Report on the Peer Tutoring Program-1973-1975 School Years." ERIC, 1976. ED 130698.

*_____. "Tutor Perceptions as an Agent for Policy Change." ERIC, Apr. 1977. ED 131878.

*Koehler, L. "Helping Students to Succeed: A Report on Tutoring and Attrition at the University of Cincinnati." ERIC, 1987. ED 290370.

Lange, A.J., and P. Jakubowski. *Responsible Assertive Behavior: Cognitive Behavorial Procedures for Trainers.* Champaigne, IL.: Research Press, 1976.

*Levin, Henry M., and Gail Meister. "Is CAI Cost-Effective?" *Phi Delta Kappan* 67 (June 1986): 745-749.

Liberty, S.S. "Learning by Tutoring in Two-year Colleges." *Staff Development for College Learning Support Systems* 4. *New Directions for College Learning Assistance.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Martin, D., et. al. "Supplemental Instruction: A Model for Increasing Student Performance and Persistence." *How to Succeed with Academically Underprepared Students.* Iowa City, IA: American College Testing Program National Center for Advancement of Educational Practices, 1982.

*Maxwell, Martha. "Does Tutoring Help? A Look At The Literature." *Review of Research in Developmental Education* 7 (1990): 1-5.

_____. *Improving Student Learning Skills: A Comprehensive Guide to Successful Practices and Programs for Increasing the Performance of Underprepared Students.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

McCarthy, Bernice. *The 4Mat System: Teaching to Learning Styles with Right/Left Mode Techniques.* Barrington, IL.: Excel, Inc., 1987.

McWhorter, K.T., and J. Levy. "The Influence of a Tutorial Program Upon Tutors." *Journal of Reading* (Jan. 1971): 221-224.

Niedermeyer, F.C. "Effects of Training on the Instructional Behaviors of

Student Tutors." *The Journal of Educational Research* 64 (Nov. 1970): 119-123.

Niemiec, Richard P., et. al. "CAI Can Be Doubly Effective." *Phi Delta Kappan* 67 (June 1986): 750-751.

*Olson, Gary. "Establishing and Maintaining a Writing Center." ERIC, 1981. ED 203961.

_____, ed. *Proceedings of the Southeastern Writing Center Conference.* ERIC, Feb. 1982. ED 214164.

*Reed, Rodney. "Peer Tutoring Programs for the Academically Deficient Student in Higher Education." ERIC, 1974. ED 113981.

*Reigstad, Thomas J., and Donald A. McAndrew. *Training Tutors for Writing Conferences.* Urbana, Ill.: NCTE, 1984.

*Rose, Mike. *Lives on the Boundary.* New York: The Free Press, 1989.

Roueche, S.D. "Elements of Program Success: Report of a National Study." *A New Look at Successful Programs.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

*Roueche, John. "Literacy Needs and Developments in American Community Colleges." ERIC, January, 1984. ED 240291.

*Runciman, Lex. "Defining Ourselves: Do We Really Want to Use the Word *Tutor?" The Writing Center Journal* XI (Fall, Winter 1990): 27-33.

*Schaeir, Barbara T., ed. *Critical Issues in Tutoring-A Collection of Articles.* ERIC, 1979. ED 174290.

*Schmelzer, Ronald V., et. al. "Using a Learning Model to Integrate Study Skills Into a Peer-Tutoring Program." ERIC, March, 1984. ED 113981.

Silver, Marcia. "Using Peer Critiques to Train Peer Tutors: Training and Using Peer Tutors." *College English* 40 (Dec. 1978): 433-436.

Shaw, G.R. "An Experiential Developmental Training Activity for Tutors."

Journal of College Reading and Learning XII (1989): 29-35.

Speier, M. "Some Conversational Problems for Ineractional Analysis." *Studies in Social Interaction*. New York: The Free Press, 1972.

Stahl, Norman A., et al. *Avenues for Chronicling and Researching the History of College Reading and Study Skills Instruction*. ERIC, February, 1985. ED 256245.

*Starks, Gretchen. "A Successful Peer Tutor Program To Improve Retention." ERIC, 1984. ED 263938.

*Trimbur, John. "Peer Tutoring: A Contradiction in Terms?" *The Writing Center Journal* VII (1987): 21-28.

* Walker, Carolyn. "Academic Tutoring at the Learning Assistance Center." ERIC, March, 1980. ED 186871.

Wallace, D. L. "Using Peer Tutors to Overcome Writer's Block." *Research and Teaching in Developmental Education* 3 (1987): 30-41.

*Zaritsky, Joyce Ship "Peer Tutoring: Issues and Concerns-Results of a Survey." ERIC, 1989. ED 315134.

Bibliography of Tools for Training

Christ, Frank. *Personal Efficiency Programs*. P. O. Box 3448, Seal Beach, CA 90740.

Ellis, David. *Becoming A Master Student*. Available from College Survival, Inc. (800) 528-8323.

Grier, Tom. Chair. CRLA Tutor Certification Committee, English Department-

Building K, University of Alaska Anchorage, 3211 Providence Drive, Anchorage, Alaska 99506. (907) 786-1926.

Leary, B.B. "Interaction Place Maps: A Tool for Tutor Training." *Journal of Developmental Education* 10 (1987): 8-12.

McCarthy, Bernice. *The 4MAT System.* Available from Excel, Inc. (800) 822-4MAT.

Olney, Claude. *Where There's a Will, There's an A.* Call toll-free (800) 225-9500 to order or (602) 949-9221 for additional information.

Student Behavior Inventory. Andragogy Associates (606) 451-9242.

The Tutor's Guide (14 videotape sessions). Available from Great Plains National (GPN) Box 80669, Lincoln, NE 68501. (800-225-4630).

Chapter 3
The League for Innovation in the Community College Survey

In the summer of 1990, a survey of the colleges in the League for Innovation in the Community College was conducted to gather information regarding peer tutor training programs and practices.

Purpose

The purpose of the survey was to determine the following:

1. whether or not peer tutors are hired
2. whether or not peer tutors are trained in a campus-wide program
3. how peer tutors are chosen
4. what kind of training peer tutors receive
5. who conducts the training and how the person is compensated
6. what, if any, program evaluation instrument is used
7. what obstacles face peer tutor directors

Methodology

A survey of peer tutor training programs was sent to the 18 districts in the League for Innovation in the Community College. Because some of the districts have more than one campus, a total of 46 campuses were surveyed. Instructors who actually train or over-see the training of student tutors were targeted for the survey.

The League for Innovation was chosen for the survey because it is the only organization of its kind for community colleges and offers a receptive and evaluative environment on which to base the study. League representatives at each of the 18 districts helped to distribute the survey instrument and to followup on the response rate. The League is dedicated to encouraging innovation, experimentation, and evaluation.

The first mailing went out on May 11, 1990, and a reminder was sent only to those districts who had not responded by June 25, 1990.

The survey instrument was created by Ellen Mohr with input from Dr. Glen Gabert, Dean of Institutional Planning and Advancement; Karen Conklin, Market Survey and Research Analyst in the Office of Institutional Research at Johnson County Community College; and Don Doucette, Associate Director of the League for Innovation in the Community College. The survey focuses on the characteristics of a school-wide training program (hiring practices, training formats and methodology, compensation, and evaluation). The survey instrument is included in the appendix to this report. [Appendix A]

During August several followup calls were necessary to get a 100 percent response rate. Final results were that all 18 districts responded with 23 of the campuses returning surveys.

The survey results refer to the statistical data in the tables which relate directly to the questions asked. Question 5 asked participants to prioritize tutor attributes. A comparison of this ranking is shown in the Peer Tutor Survey results. Only the top three qualities and the lowest rankings are referred to in the results of both surveys. Questions 11 and 13 are revealed separately because findings are not measureable but are individualized answers.

Proposed Analysis of Results

The conclusion correlates the information gathered from the readings with the results of the survey. Any issues or concerns which surfaced during the study are discussed, and finally, the gathered information is synthesized into a proposal for a model program to train peer tutors.

Results

Of the 45 campuses within the 18 districts surveyed, 13 had peer tutor training programs and participated in the survey. A directory of these programs is provided on p. 32 .

TABLE 1
Peer Tutor Training in League Schools

District Responses (n=18)	No. of Responses	Percent
Have peer tutor training	8	44.4%
Do not have peer tutor training	9	50.0
Is mixed having one campus with training one campus with no training other campuses with no response	1	5.6
Campus Responses (n=45)		
Were in districts with no program	14	31.2*
Responded with programs	13	28.9
Of these 13 2 campuses responded by completing the survey even though the program is not school wide		
Were unknown or did not respond	18	40.0

*Note: If the district with mixed responses above is considered to have no training program, then the percentage with no programs becomes 46.7%.

All of the thirteen campuses offered tutoring in a variety of subjects with math, writing and speech, reading, physical science, and foreign language being the most tutored. Table 2 shows the other subjects that are supplemented with peer tutor services.

TABLE 2
Tutored Subjects

	No. of Responses	Percent
1. Computer Science	7	58.3
2. Foreign Language	9	75.0
3. Health -Phys. Ed.	3	25.0
4. Health -Related Sc.	8	66.7
5. Humanities - Arts	8	66.7
6. Math	11	91.7
7. Phys. Science	9	75.0
8. Reading	9	75.0
9. Social Sc. - Econ.	8	66.7
10. Study Skills	8	66.7
11. Writing - Speech	10	83.3
12. Other	6	50.0

Most of the colleges responding to the survey had a training program for newly hired tutors (100%) and an on-going program for students serving as peer tutors (91.7%).

Tutors were recruited primarily through solicited instructor referrals (100%) and flyers (91.7%) circulated throughout the campus. Other methods of recruitment included postings (75.0%), the campus newspaper (75.0%), and a faculty/student newsletter (41.7%).

When participants were asked to rank the characteristics a prospective peer tutor should have, dependability, knowledge of the subject area to be tutored, and interpersonal or communication skills were rated the most important. Computer literacy was ranked the least important attribute a tutor needs.

Most of the responding community colleges had a tutor coordinator (66.7%). The titles for this position are listed in the Verbatim comments.

Of the programs surveyed 50.0% had on-going training for their peer tutors. Generally, the programs had an initial training session soon after tutors were hired with regular meetings held throughout the employment period. Three of the programs described in the Verbatim comments required extensive training for the tutors to reach mastery level. Two of these programs were for the training of paraprofessionals not for training peer tutors which was the intent of this study.

Eleven respondents noted that workshops were the favored format for their peer tutor training (91.7%). Some used a classroom format (credit and non-credit) as required training while others trained on the job or in individual meetings.

Peer tutor training respondents ranked individual conferences, videotapes, discussion groups and role playing as the most effective methods for training peer tutors . Generally, a combination of methods was used. (See Table 3)

TABLE 3
Methods of Training

	No. of Responses	Percent
Role play	9	75.0 %
Videotape	10	83.3
Individual conferences	10	83.3
Lectures	8	66.7
Outside assignments	4	33.3
Discussion groups	11	91.7
Lab/center observation	5	41.7
Other	4	33.3

33

Included in the training curriculum were interpersonal skills, learning styles, college policies and procedures, and teaching strategies. Over half of the respondents included all four.

Respondents were asked how instructors and peer tutors were compensated for their services. Most of the peer tutors were paid an hourly wage, while instructors who helped in the training of peer tutors were contracted as part of their assignment to assist in the program. (See Table 4)

TABLE 4
Compensation

For Instructors	For Peer Tutors
salary	salary
benefits	credits
no instructors	3 college credits plus hourly wage ($5.35-6.70 per hr.)
release time	$7.00 hr. plus 4 % vacation
office hours in L.C.	tutors can choose Level 1 training for credit, pay, or volunteer (most take pay)
paid part-time instructors	$5.00 per hour
faculty liaisons to LAC receive reassigned (part of their load) time	$6.00 per hour
$ 5.20 per hour	compensation for training
$ 6.00 per hour	paid at college student worker rates
Part of the responsibility of Academic Skills Center faculty	
some volunteer, some receive honorarium	

All of the training programs responding to the survey had an evaluation instrument filled out by students who had been tutored. Seventy-five percent of the

programs required a conference between the tutor and program coordinator. Some of the programs evaluated the tutors through a written narration by the coordinator and/or self-evaluation by the tutors. Table 5 shows the respondents' choices of evaluation instrument.

TABLE 5
Evaluation

	No. of Responses	Percent
Written evaluation by instructor	4	33.30%
Conference with instructor	9	75.00
Self-evaluation	6	50.00
Evaluation by tutees	12	100.00
Other	3	25.00

Question 13 asked the respondents to note any innovative facet of the peer tutor training program. Comments were the following:

> Peer counselors/tutors are encouraged to join the Organization of Peer Counselors and Tutors (TOPCATs), one of the clubs on campus. Officers are elected, and the club sponsors one or two community-minded activities each year.
>
> We have trained tutors in a communications 300 course to provide tutoring employing a morphographic spelling approach.
>
> Tutors will be certified through national accreditation by CRLA (College Reading and Learning Association).
>
> Study skills is integrated into their presentations. Adult learning theory is

included as well as learning styles and the impact of assessment testing and placement can have on a student's success.

Tutor training is presented in a seminar format and is truly interactive.
Returning tutors attend sessions in a mentoring and sharing role.
Learning logs are required after each session to assist tutors' understanding and internalization of the information and strategies presented.
The training program has the following as a foundation:

Student development theory--to help tutors become aware of students' need and help them become independent learners as they move toward their educational goal.

4MAT--Is an instructional model used for concepts presented in order to reach each tutor at his/her best and to help each tutor learn to stretch and learn in other ways.

Metacognition--helps students become cognizant of their own strengths and weaknesses and develop new strategies to help their students.

Use of the Study Behavior Inventory

One of the services provided:

Assign in-class tutors to developmental classes--

- Usually involves 55 to 60 classes each quarter
- Classes structured to be individualized and self-paced
- Tutors work with students on individual difficulties
- Under direction of faculty while in class
- Allows students to progress more rapidly

Another service:

- Provide assessment of learning styles (KOLB LSI) and interpretation to classes and individualized basis
- Also assess study skills--use LASSI for individual counseling

Looking at becoming CRLA certified
Tutors work in computer lab answering both technical and content questions

One program which seemed to have been adopted by several campuses and was being considered in others was the College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA) certified training program for tutors. It was centered around levels of tutor training and for several campuses was based on the UCLA videotapes, *A Tutor's Guide,* accompanied with study questions and seminars. It is interesting and important to note that the certified programs were generally programs that did not hire enrolled students as tutors (peer tutors) but instead hired faculty members, former students, community members, and retired citizens as tutors.

Another program used the Study Behavior Inventory published by Androgogy Associates and discussed in the review of literature of this study. The program used the inventory to assess students' study skills and academic perception to advise them into learning assistance and developmental programs.

Some campuses had acquired grants to finance peer tutor programs.

When asked what was the greatest obstacle facing peer tutor programs, 50.00% of the respondents answered that financial support was difficult to obtain and maintain. Other responses can be found in Table 6.

TABLE 6
Obstacles

	No. of responses	**Percent**
Financial support	6	50.0 %
Recruitment/staffing	3	25.0
Administrative support	1	8.3
Instructor/staff support	1	8.3
Other	4	33.3

Discussion of results

The League survey showed that although most of the surveyed colleges employed peer tutors as a means to assisting the underprepared student, few of these colleges had training programs for their tutors. A plausible explanation for the absence of such programs may be that individual content areas trained their own tutors and did not respond to the survey.

The most interesting point of this study was that the survey data and the literature indicated a need for peer tutor training yet few colleges had a formal program. One reason for this discrepancy may be that students do not hold peer tutor positions for long; therefore, any extensive training may seem a waste of time and money. Another possible reason may be the attitude toward what peer tutors do. If they work primarily with students whose skills are not college level, then they may be looked upon as part of developmental education which is frowned upon by many in academia. Normally, finances and administrative support come with difficulty for these programs. However, if peer tutors are trained to be collaborators with their fellow students (both parties gaining from the tuteeing) and if they are recognized as an excellent resource for the underprepared student (a primary benefactor of the open enrollment policy), then the attitude may change.

Directory of Peer Tutor Training Programs

The community colleges listed in the directory are those colleges which responded to the survey with information about their peer tutor training programs.

Central Piedmont Community College
Charlotte, North Carolina
Contact person: Steve Mullis, Instructor-Coordinator of Advancement Studies
CPCC, P.O Box 35009
Charlotte, NC 28235
Telephone # 704-342-6423

Dallas County Community College District
Dallas, Texas
Contact person: Theresa Sternat, LAC Coordinator
3737 Motley Dr.
Eastfield campus
Mesquite, Tx. 75150
Telephone # 214-324-7177

Foothill-DeAnza Community College
Los Altos Hills, California

Foothill College
Contact person: Anne M. Trostle, Coordinator, Tutorial Program
12345 El Monte Road
Los Altos Hills, CA 94022
Telephone # 415-949-7447

DeAnza College
Contact person: Carol Clawson, Tutorial Coordinator
21250 Stevens Creek Blvd.
Cupertino, CA 95014
Telephone # 408 864-8485

Humber College of Applied Arts and Technology
Toronto, Canada
Contact person: Cheryl Taylor, Coordinator Peer Services
North Campus
205 Humber College Boulevard
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M9W 5L7
Telephone # 416-675-3111

Maricopa Community Colleges
Phoenix, Arizona

Scottsdale Community College
Contact person: Gene Kerstiens, Director LAC
Scottsdale, AZ 85250
Telephone # 213-423-6434

Paradise Valley Community College
Contact Persons: Rick Sheet, LAC Director and Sally Rings, LAC Faculty Coordinator
18401 N. 32nd St.
Phoenix, AZ 85302
Telephone # 602-493-2925

Gateway Community College
Contact Person: Nancy Siefer, Ph.D., Director Learning Center
108 N. 40th St.
Phonix, AZ 85034
Telephone # 602-392-5150

Mesa Community College
Contact Person: Phil A. Gonvers, Learning Center Coordinator
Mesa, Arizona 85202
Telephone # 602-461-7665

Miami-Dade Community Colleges
Miami, Florida
Contact person: Dr. Suzanne Richter, Dean of Instruction
Wolfson Campus
300 N.E. 2nd Sve.
Miami, Florida 33132
Telephone # 305-347-3043

Moraine Valley Community College
Palos Hills, Illinois
Contact person: Dr. Irene H. Brodie, Dean, Developmental Education/Academic Skills Center
10900 South 88th Avenue
Palos Hills, IL 60465
Telephone # 708-974-5712

St. Louis Community College
St. Louis, Missouri
Contact person: Jane Hassinger, Career Track Coordinator
3400 Pershall Rd.
St. Louis, MO 63135
Telephone # 314-595-4265

Sinclair Community College
Dayton, Ohio
Contact person: Wanda Baer, Director of Tutorial Services
Dayton, Ohio 45402
Telephone # 513-226-2792

Chapter 4
The Peer Tutor Survey

In the Spring of 1990, a survey of Johnson County Community College's peer tutors in the Math Center, Academic Achievement Center, and Writing Center was conducted to gather information about how student tutors view their tutoring.

Purpose: The purpose of the survey was to determine the following:

1. to see what tutor qualities and characteristics peer tutors view as important
2. to see what skills peer tutors believe are important in a training program
3. to see what obstacles peer tutors face
4. to compare the peer tutors' choices with the trainers' answers.

Methodology

To get the peer tutor's perspective about training procedures, a brief survey was conducted through the Academic Achievement Center, Math Center, and Writing Center during the spring semester, 1990. Four tutors from the Academic Achievement Center, six from the Writing Center, and eleven from the Math Center (a total of 21 peer tutors) participated in the survey. All of the tutors were experienced (having worked a minimum of one semester) and had some training within their individual areas.

Tutors were asked to prioritize lists of qualities, characteristics, skills, and problems inherent in tutorial situations. Only the top several choices and the lowest are reported in the results. The survey instrument can be found in the appendix to this report. [Appendix B]

Proposed Analysis of the Survey

The results of the peer tutor survey analyze the top several rankings and lowest choice and where possible connections are made to the League survey.

Results

The surveyed peer tutor ranked patience, a positive attitude, and understanding as the most important personal qualities a peer tutor should possess. They disagreed with tutor training coordinators that dependability is the most important attribute. Peer tutors ranked empathy as the least needed attribute.

When asked which attitudes, behaviors and skills are the most valuable to a peer tutor, the surveyed tutors ranked knowledge of subject and interpersonal skills high. This choice is the same as the surveyed tutor training coordinators. Both surveyed groups ranked computer literacy as the least needed skill.

Although training coordinators agreed with the peer tutors that interpersonal skills should be a priority in the training program, tutors noted that knowledge of the subject should also be included. Most coordinators believed that knowledge should be one of the criteria for hiring a student as a peer tutor. Again, computer literacy as part of the training curriculum is ranked low by both groups.

The fourth question asked the peer tutors to rank the challenging problems they must face. Most of the tutors felt that difficult or demanding students was the greatest challenge. They also noted that interpreting the assignments students bring to a session is sometimes a problem. Again, peer tutors believe computer literacy to be the least of their problems.

Chapter 5
Conclusion

Published literature and the surveys show that peer tutors are an excellent resource for underprepared students whose skills put them at risk. Colleges which are seeking avenues to serve these students should consider the hiring of peer tutors as one important means to this end.

If students are to be hired as peer tutors, they must be interviewed and selected using criteria which includes competency in the knowledge area to be tutored as determined by the appropriate content instructor, good interpersonal skills as determined by the tutor coordinator in a personal interview, and good work skills as determined through previous work records.

Students who are hired as peer tutors should undergo a training period prior to their tutoring and on-going as deemed necessary by the coordinator of the program. Thus training should include college policies and procedures, learning and teaching styles and strategies, and interpersonal skills and be taught in a variety of formats which include role playing, workshops or discussion groups, observation, and videotapes.

Peer tutor programs should be evaluated by not only the tutor coordinator but also the instructors whose subject is being tutored, by the students who are being tutored, and by the tutors themselves. The evaluation instrument should include some open-ended questions. Evaluating the peer tutors and the program is necessary to maintaining quality and credibility in the program.

Furthermore, all criteria for selecting, training, and evaluating peer tutors across the college campus should be uniform, especially if individual content areas are using peer tutors rather than one coordinator overseeing all campus tutors.

Guidelines for salary of tutors and coordinators, training length, and other administrative policies should also be consistent.

One issue which surfaced during this research was the use of the word peer tutor to refer to anyone who tutors. The intent of the study was to use the term to refer to enrolled students only. Just like the students they serve, the tutors are all ages ranging from 18 to 60, they come from all cultures, and they are specializing or majoring in a variety of subjects or fields, often different from the one they are tutoring. Community college tutors rarely stay more than two years as most transfer to four-year universities. As "peers" they are not considered to be "professional." These students do not teach; they collaborate with fellow students. They do not have to be experts, but they must be knowledgeable about the subjects they tutor. Having completed the courses they tutor, being recommended by the instructors of those courses, and then receiving training in how to lead a tutoring session are important facets to a tutor's success. Recently literature and presentations at national conferences have questioned the meaning of "tutor," noting that it has developed a negative connotation because of its longtime connection to developmental education. Still no one has come up with anything better and the term "peer" which denotes "equals" seems appropriate.

Much of the literature studied referred to graduate or upperclassmen as "peer tutors." Some of the League colleges studied in the survey use tutors who are community or staff members. They are part-time instructors, retired community members, or students enrolled elsewhere; they are not "peer tutors" using the profile given above. Although this may be viewed as a discrepancy, it doesn't discredit the study because the same needed attributes hold for any tutor. The prospective tutor must meet criteria, such as knowledge of subject, good interpersonal skills, and good work habits (all qualities rated high by the surveyed schools). Also, training and evaluating are still important facets of the tutor program. And much of the training curriculum remains the same because it involves good teaching strategies which keep the learning student-centered. However, the intensity of the training does probably vary. Obviously, the length of the training would be less in a community college where peer tutors are hired and probably only remain for several semesters to that of a community college

who hires professional tutors who will be around for some time.

If colleges, especially community colleges, have as their primary goal the success of all their students and if this study notes that peer tutoring is an effective way to ensure success, then colleges should encourage and support a structured peer tutor training program and institutional guidelines for hiring and evaluating student tutors.

A Model for Peer Tutor Programs: A Proposal

Introduction- The practice of employing students to tutor in all disciplines should be continued and expanded as needs grow and the college population increases. Peer tutors are an *important* component to programs designed to help the underprepared student.

Recommendation-To ensure that JCCC's peer tutors meet the standards reviewed in this study, they should be carefully screened before being hired, given extensive training (prior to tutoring and on-going) and evaluated. Campus-wide guidelines for hiring, training and evaluating should be agreed upon by the instructors involved in the various peer tutor programs and supported by the school administrators.

***Selection**

General recommendations for selection criteria, interviewing techniques, and hiring procedures should be agreed upon by the lead instructors. The lead instructor in the individual content areas where peer tutors are hired should be ultimately responsible for the interviewing and hiring of the peer tutors in their areas. This study emphasizes the need for students to have the following qualifications to become peer tutors:

A. Competency in the content area
B. Recommendation(s) from at least one content instructor
C. Good interpersonal skills
D. Good work and study habits as shown in previous employment and school records (ie., attendance, punctuality, G.P.A., competence)

•Training

Structure of the peer tutor training program should be two-fold. First, the training program should be developed as an on-going program . One general meeting for all peer tutors (newly hired and returning) before tutoring begins could include videotapes 1-5 with emphasis on learning styles and the Socratic method of questioning. Another meeting 4-5 weeks into the semester could cover videotapes 6-9 with emphasis on the tutee profile. Other meetings would be handled by the lead instructors in the individual content areas.

Secondly, a school-wide general handbook would provide an easy reference for tutors and instructors and reinforce a training program. The handbook should include general information about school policies, student services, demographic information about the college's population. If the handbook were an open-ring bound book, each lead instructor could then include specific information unique to the content area: record-keeping procedures and the location and use of available resources for tutor and student use.

The next section of the handbook should include techniques or strategies to help the tutor identify the tutee's problem and focus on the tutee finding the solution. More specifically, short descriptions of the following strategies could be included:

1. An overview of learning styles and teaching strategies
2. Tutorial principles
3. The Socratic method, with emphasis on listening and responding skills
4. Tutoring special audiences, such as the continuing adult, the underprepared student, the handicapped student, and international student.

All of these topics are discussed in the videotapes (*The Tutors Guide)* which we purchased last summer (1990). Tutors could view the tapes together, in small groups, and/or individually. Each tutor would be provided a learning log in which his/her reactions would be recorded. These logs and tapes would become the focus of small group discussions. I believe the tapes which cover general information about tutoring should be a basis to bring all of JCCC's tutors together to share their experiences and show the commonality or similarity of their work. The content-specific tapes could become the basis for meetings in the individual areas. The

meetings could include, along with the themes from the tapes, review of current literature, role playing, and open discussions on issues of concern. Peer tutors should be paid an hourly wage for their attending and participating in these meetings.

***Evaluation**

Evaluation of the peer tutors should include the following :

A. Tutees answering a questionaire about the help they received. Both closed and open-ended questions should be included.

B. On-going evaluation through observation by the lead instructor

C. Self-evaluations by the peer tutors and discussed with the lead instructor

D. Instructors of tutees should be allowed to critique the program

Evaluation of the peer tutors should also be discussed among the lead instructors for school-wide consistency in the program.

Conclusion: The handbook would provide a beneficial guide for instructors and tutors of general policies and tutor principles. It would give school-wide continuity to the procedures of hiring, training, and evaluating peer tutors. Common meetings strategically planned by the lead instructors would provide a climate for open forum discussions where tutors from across the disciplines could share experiences, problems, and successes. As JCCC grows and each content area feels more and more isolated, these opportunities to bring the disciplines together become more and more important.

APPENDIX A:
LEAGUE SURVEY OF PEER TUTOR TRAINING PRACTICES
COVER LETTER

JOHNSON COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
SURVEY OF PEER TUTOR TRAINING PROGRAMS

To Tutorial Services Administrator:

We at Johnson County Community College are interested in learning about peer tutor training programs--their guidelines and practices--in League colleges. This study is part of an approved League project, and its results will be published and shared with you.

Please take a few minutes to answer each of the following questions as honestly and completely as possible. A preaddressed, postage-paid envelope is enclosed for your convenience in returning the completed questionnaire to us. We would appreciate receiving it by June 1, 1990, if possible.

Questions about this study may be directed to Ellen Mohr, the project coordinator, at (913) 469-8500, ext. 3497. Any additional information not included in the survey or materials describing your tutor training program would be greatly appreciated. Thank you for your cooperation.

_____Check here if you do not train peer tutors. Then please identify your college for our records, and return the questionnaire in the envelope provided. Thank you.

College name: _____

---

1. In what subject areas does your college offer peer tutoring for students?
(Check all that apply)

____1. Computer science
____2. Foreign language
____3. Health/physical education
____4. Health related science
____5. Humanities/arts
____6. Math
____7. Physical science
____8. Reading
____9. Social science/economics
____10. Study skills
____11. Writing/speech
____12. Other (specify)

2. Do you have a college wide peer tutor training program?
____1. Yes ____2. No (if no, skip to question 15)

3. Which of the following individuals is your peer tutor training program designed to serve? (check all that apply)

_____1. Applicants prior to employment as tutors
_____2. Newly hired tutors
_____3. Currently employed tutors
_____4. Any interested student
_____5. Other (specify)

4. In which of the following ways are peer tutors recruited?
_____1. Postings on and off campus
_____2. Campus student newspaper
_____3. Faculty/staff newsletter
_____4. Solicited instructor referrals
_____5. Flyers to appropriate instructors/students
_____6. Other (specify)

5. Identify the most important attribute with a "1," the second with a "2," and so on.

_____1. Dependability
_____2. Interpersonal skills
_____3. Intuition
_____4. Knowledge of subject
_____5. Empathy
_____6. Patience
_____7. Computer literacy
_____8. Collaborative understanding
_____9. Other (specify)

6. Who is responsible for coordinating your peer tutor training?

_____1. Tutor training instructor
_____2. Combination of instructors from various disciplines where tutors are employed
_____3. Staff development
_____4. Other (specify)

7. What is the duration of your peer tutor training program?

_____1. Less than 1 hour
_____2. 1-4 hours
_____3. 4-8 hours
_____4. 8-16 hours
_____5. On-going
_____6. Other (specify)

8. Which of the following <u>formats</u> are utilized in your peer tutor training program? (check all that apply)

_____1. Workshops
_____2. Credit courses
_____3. Internships
_____4. Other (specify)

9. Which of the following methods are utilized in your peer tutor training program? (check all that apply)

____1. Role play
____2. Videotape/media presentations
____3. Individual conferences
____4. Lectures
____5. Outside assignments
____6. Discussion groups
____7. Lab/center observation
____8. Other

10. Which of the following areas are covered in your peer tutor training curriculum? (check all that apply)

____1. Interpersonal skills
____2. Learning strategies
____3. College policies and procedures
____4. Teaching strategies
____5. Other (specify)

11. What method of compensation is utilized in your peer tutor training program?

A. For instructors:

B. For peer tutors:

12. How are peer tutors evaluated? (check all that apply)

____1. Written evaluation completed by supervisor
____2. Conference with supervisor
____3. Self-evaluation
____4. Evaluation completed by students being tutored
____5. Other (specify)

13. Briefly describe any facet of your peer tutor program which you perceive as being particularly innovative.

14. In your opinion, which of the following problems poses the greatest obstacle in creating an "ideal" peer tutor training program at your college? (check only one)

____1. Financial support
____2. Recruitment/staffing
____3. Administrative support
____4. Instructor/staff support
____5. Other (specify)

15. Please provide the following information for the directory of peer tutor training programs which will be included in the League report.

Name_____

Title_____

College Address_____

City, State, ZIP_____

Telephone_____

Any comments or suggestions which would assist us in developing an effective peer tutor training program or any descriptive materials about your program which could be used in the resource directory would be greatly appreciated. Thank you for your help!

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: May 8, 1990

TO: League Representatives

FROM: Glen Gabert

SUBJECT: Information Request

Ellen Mohr on our staff has been designated a "League Fellow" for a sabbatical project she is undertaking to identify exemplary practices related to peer tutor training.

Enclosed is a survey which I would appreciate your forwarding to the person who would be most familiar with peer tutoring programs in your district. If there are several programs making distribution of the questionnaire to more than one person appropriate, the instrument may be copied or I can provide other copies immediately upon request.

Return of completed surveys by June 1 would be appreciated.

Respond to: Ellen Mohr
Communications & Academic Enhancements
Johnson County Community College
12345 College at Quivira
Overland Park, KS 66210-1299

sb

APPENDIX B:
JCCC PEER TUTOR SURVEY OF TUTOR CHARACTERISTICS

JOHNSON COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Survey for Tutors

Dear Peer Tutor: Please prioritize each of the following lists of qualities, skills, and problems inherent in tutorial situations by ranking them from **most** important (#1) to least important, in your opinion. Your input will assist us in designing an interdisciplinary peer tutor training program at JCCC. Return the completed survey to Libby by **Friday, May 11, 1990**. Thank you for your help.

1. Personal qualities a person should possess to become a peer tutor:

____ Patience
____ Tact
____ Empathy
____ Flexibility
____ Dependability
____ Manners/courtesy
____ Positive attitude
____ Understanding

2. Attitudes, behaviors, and skills a person should possess to become a peer tutor:

____ Interpersonal communication skills
____ Dress
____ Professionalism
____ Computer literacy
____ Self-motivation
____ Willingness to work with others
____ Questioning skills
____ Knowledge of subject area

3. Skills a tutor should learn during training:

____ Research skills (where to find resources and materials)
____ Record-keeping procedure
____ Computer literacy
____ Knowledge of services in other areas
____ Learning strategies
____ Teaching strategies
____ Enhancements of interpersonal skills
____ Knowledge of subject area

4. Most challenging problems faced by peer tutors:

_____ Working with difficult students (e.g., rude, demanding)
_____ Working with ESL students (English as a second language)
_____ Working with computer illiterate students
_____ Finding time for the large number of students requiring services
_____ Developing familiarity with the wide range of resources and materials available
_____ Interpreting individual student assignments
_____ Dealing with insensitivity of fellow workers
_____ Dealing with fellow workers who do not share the workload

Added comments are welcome, especially any suggestions you might have for curriculum or agendas which could be included in a peer tutor training program.

APPENDIX C:
VERBATIM COMMENTS FROM THE LEAGUE FOR INNOVATION IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE SURVEY

VERBATIM COMMENTS

Many of the questions on the survey included an "other." Verbatim comments from the community college tutor directors who responded to the request for other comments follow along with the question number. Especially insightful comments are discussed in the survey results narrative, p. 24.

Question 1

1 adult high school
4 all programs vocational and academic
6 chemistry, physics, accounting, music theory, plus special requests
7 all classes offered
8 any course on campus
10 accounting
13 electronics, accounting, auto body, sign language, biology

Question 3

1 volunteers

Question 4

3 postings
6 department secretaries, individuals who received tutoring and now wish to tutor, etc.
7 orientations and classroom presentations
11 information included in mailings to honors students
12 Dean's list
13 drop-in applicants

Question 5

6 communication skills
12 communication skills

Question 6

3 tutorial coordinator (classified)
5 L.C. director/coordinator
6 learning center coordinator
8 learning center staff
9 student retention coordinators
10 dean of subdivision and assigned instrutors from the academic skill center faculty
11 program coordinator
12 director of tutorial program
13 tutor coordinator

Question 7

6 15 hours for entry level to 40 hours for complete program
7 Level 1--15.25 hours
Level 2-- 6.25 hours
Level 3-- 6.25 + hours
13 We're in the process of developing a 10-12 hour training program

Question 8

1 weekly class (non-credit) meetings
8 on-the-job
9 individual meetings
10 mock tutoring sessions
11 videotapes

Question 9

1 guest speakers
6 "teacher"-led discussions
7 mentoring
10 worksheets dealing with tutoring

Question 10

8 study skills, time management, study behavior
12 learning styles, tutoring problems, communication/listening
13 learning styles; safety and security policies; special populations. ie. handicapped, and/or culturally different students

Question 12

3 instructor input when offered
7 by instructors (optional)
12 observation by staff-periodically

Question 14

2 time available for tutorial coordinator to devote to tutor training
4 We have a solid well regarded program but the "competition" for tutors is great.
7 We currently have all of the above and therefore have been able to develop our "ideal" training program.
8 Turnover of tutors and attitude of tutors for whom this is <u>not</u> a permanent job.
12 availability of time for tutors to take training workshops

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
JUL 26 1991